PN-AAF-723

A.I.D. and the Universities

Report to the Administrator
of the
Agency For International Development

by John W. Gardner
President, Carnegie Corporation of New York

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Washington, D. C.

The Task Force on A.I.D.—University Relations

Chairman
John W. Gardner
President, Carnegie Corporation of New York

Vice Chairman
William W. Marvel
President, Education and World Affairs

Nongovernmental Members

William Friday
President, University of North Carolina

Charles P. McCurdy Jr.
Executive Secretary, Association of American Universities

Roger Revelle
Dean of Research, University of California

Russell I. Thackrey
Executive Secretary, Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Logan Wilson
President, American Council on Education

O. Meredith Wilson
President, University of Minnesota

Governmental Members

Francis B. Appelbee
Procurement Policy Staff
Office of Material Resources

Leona Baumgartner, M.D.
Assistant Administrator
Office of Technical Cooperation and Research

David Z. Beckler
Assistant to the Director,
Office of Science and Technology
Executive Office of the President

James M. Blume
Director, Office of Technical Support
Bureau for Near East and South Asia

Karl F. Bode
Chief, Planning Assistance Division
Office of Program Coordination Staff

Manlio F. de Angelis
Deputy Assistant Administrator, Management
Bureau for Africa and Europe

O. L. Mimms
Acting Chief, International Training Division
Office of Program Support

Marvin Weissman
Director, Institutional Development
Bureau for Latin America

Harold L. Enarson
Director, Education Service
Office of Technical Cooperation and Research

Merwin W. Kaye,
General Counsel Representative
Office of the General Counsel

W. P. Kelly
Associate Assistant Administrator for Procurement Policy
Office of Material Resources

Julius J. Kessler
Chief, Contract Services Division
Office of Material Resources

Edward E. Kunze
Special Assistant for Small Business
Office of Material Resources

Erven J. Long
Director, Agricultural Service
Office of Technical Cooperation and Research

Clifford H. Wilson
Director, Far East Technical Advisory Staff
Bureau for the Far East

Wallace E. Woodbury
Special Assistant, Office of the Controller

Staff Director

Carl H. Martini
Treasurer, Education and World Affairs

In addition, William R. Hooper of the Office of Science and Technology, Hiram S. Phillips and Jonathan Silverstone, both of A.I.D. and Richard A. Humphrey of the American Council on Education, met with the Task Force as replacements or alternates.

Foreword

Over the past decade, the contributions of U.S. universities to the foreign assistance effort have been impressive. Nor has this been a one-way street. Universities have gained from their experience in overseas service. Such service broadens the horizons of participating faculty members, deepens their understanding of their own disciplines, and strengthens the capacity of the university to prepare young men and women for today's world.

But good as this relationship may have been, it can be much better. Both A.I.D. and the universities believe that substantial improvement is possible. Arrangements for planning and executing projects can be improved. Contracting methods can be simpler and more efficient. Greater use can be made of the full institutional resources of the universities, to the advantage both of the universities in increasing their strength in international fields and of the Government in improving its effectiveness in assisting economic and social progress in less developed countries.

As a first major step in strengthening the partnership between A.I.D. and the universities, in July 1963, I asked Mr. John Gardner, the distinguished president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, to organize a task force on A.I.D. and the universities, to examine carefully the relationships of the Agency with the universities, and to make such recommendations as he saw fit. The following report is the result of seven months of intensive fact-finding, discussion, and analysis.

The report—as was to be expected—is forthright, lucid, and provocative. It seems to me to lay just the right kind of analytical basis, and to set out just the right kind of conceptual guidelines, for A.I.D. and the universities to use in proceeding to work out practical improvements in our joint undertakings.

Within A.I.D. we are now in process of preparing a specific plan of action for our part in bringing about the improvements identified in the Gardner report.

As the report itself makes plain, action is also required by the universities as well as by A.I.D. to achieve the results desired. We are accordingly

making the report widely available, and inviting study of it by all concerned. We look forward in the months ahead to a series of joint discussions and actions with the universities in order to advance toward our common objectives.

I should like to acknowledge here our deep indebtedness to Mr. Gardner, and to all who worked with him in preparing this landmark report. We owe much to the leadership of the American Council on Education and of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges for their constant help and encouragement. We are especially grateful to Education and World Affairs and to its president, Mr. William Marvel, for the many services they provided—not least in sharing the costs of the task force. The success of this initial stage of our work on these A.I.D.-university problems augurs well for the outcome of the efforts that now lie ahead.

David E. Bell
April 13, 1964

Table of Contents

		Pages
Foreword		v
Acknowledgements		ix
Introduction		xi
I.	The University's Role in Technical Assistance	1-3
	Nongovernmental Participation	1
	Short- Versus Long-Term Goals	2
	Role of Host Government	3
II.	The A.I.D.-University Relationship	4-14
	Conflict and Misunderstanding	4
	The Complexity of the University's Role	5
	The Proper Role of the University	7
	Degree of Autonomy of the University in the Field	8
	Involvement of the Whole University	9
	The University as a Resource	11
	What A.I.D. Can Do to Help	14
III.	Participant Training	15-17
IV.	Research	18-20
	Program of Research Grants and Contracts	18
	Project-Related Research	19
	In-House Research	19
	What the University Can Do	20
V.	University Contracts and Contract Administration	21-31
	Selection of Contractors	21
	Selection Criteria	22
	Requirements for an Effective Selection Process	23

Pages

Contract Administration 24
Contract Flexibility 25
Personnel Clearance 27
Compensation 28
Indirect Costs 28
Restrictions on Publication 28
Activities Funded Under the Contract 29
Loans as a Means of Funding University Contracts 30

VI. Personnel and Training 32-40
Recruiting Problems 32
A Career Service 33
The Foreign Development Reserve 34
Planning 36
Survey of Personnel Resources 36
Education and Training 37
Contractual Arrangements to Meet Personnel Needs 39

VII. Organization 41-46
Nongovernmental Arrangements 41
1. Combining the Strength of Several Institutions 41
2. Performing a Function More Readily Performed by a Centralized Agency 41
3. Tapping Talent Outside the Leading Institutions 41
4. Lending University Sponsorship and Prestige to Semiautonomous Operations 42
A New Unit Within A.I.D. 42

VIII. A Semiautonomous Government Institute 47-51

Acknowledgements

This report is the sole responsibility of the author, but its preparation would not have been possible without the valuable assistance of the Task Force on A.I.D.-University Relations.

Education and World Affairs provided staff support for the study. I am particularly grateful to William Marvel, president of Education and World Affairs, Ralph Smuckler, vice president; Carl Martini, treasurer; Peter Gillingham; Sheldon Pollack; Roger Sheldon and Muriel Greenhill. Mr. Martini served not only as a member of the Task Force but as staff director of the study and more than anyone else held the project together from beginning to end.

It is impossible to express adequately my debt to the many hundreds of persons who responded to questions, contributed suggestions or took the time to write informative letters. I would like particularly to thank the Commission on International Education of the American Council on Education, and especially Walter H. C. Laves. Among our other advisers, Frederick Harbison, Don K. Price, and Frederick W. Riggs were also extremely helpful.

I cannot conclude these acknowledgements without expressing my admiration for the extremely cooperative attitude of many officials of A.I.D. Although they cannot be held responsible for any of the views expressed in the report, they contributed greatly to the author's understanding of the critical questions involved.

John W. Gardner

March 2, 1964

Introduction

A.I.D. and its predecessor agencies have forged an impressive partnership with the universities. There is a record of solid accomplishment that reflects great credit on both sides of the partnership. We could have devoted a substantial section of this report to a recital of accomplishments.

But neither A.I.D. nor the universities are interested in dwelling on past achievements. They want to know how they can improve their performance and their partnership in the future. And there is every reason to believe that such improvement is possible. A.I.D., despite the intensity and volume of recent criticism directed at it, is probably in better shape as an organization than it has ever been. And the universities, after a decade of experience with overseas contracts, are beginning to exhibit a seasoned competence in performance. The reader is asked to bear these considerations in mind as he studies the report: it is not a balanced presentation of accomplishments and failures; it deliberately focuses on the problems in what has been an extremely fruitful relationship.

This report is based on seven months of intensive study. Comments were obtained, orally and in writing, from many hundreds of individuals who had had first-hand experience with A.I.D.-university relations. Officials of A.I.D. cooperated fully and frankly in supplying information and commenting on policy. The author accepts sole responsibility for the views in the report, but the judgments expressed have in every instance been tested against factual information or against the views of a variety of qualified and experienced individuals.

In concentrating on the universities, the report inevitably does less than justice to the role of other agencies and institutions. While we acknnowledge this imbalance (and ask the reader to bear it in mind), we do not think of the universities as "just another" source of technical services. We believe that in the case of A.I.D., as has already proven true with industry and other government agencies, the universities will prove to be uniquely valuable allies. They are the institutions that will produce the new knowledge in the natural and social sciences on which better programs of technical

assistance will someday be built, and they will educate the men who will run those programs. In short, they are not just performers of momentarily useful chores. To borrow a famous phrase, they have the future in their bones.

I. The University's Role in Technical Assistance

Both Congress and the American public have expressed repeated irritation over the foreign aid program. The annual battles over authorization and appropriations grow more fierce with each passing year. The atmosphere of conflict surrounding the entire program conceals the fact that a part of that program—technical assistance—is not only much less controversial but has actually enjoyed consistent support from important segments of Congress and the public.

It is now generally recognized that the effort of the developing nations to modernize themselves is one of the most challenging tasks of our day. From the first proposal of the Point Four program, the idea of placing our skills and knowledge at the disposal of these nations has stirred the imagination of the American people. And from the beginning, universities have been in the forefront of those interested.

University collaboration on programs of technical assistance is now a long-established fact. As of December 31, 1963, 72 universities in the United States were performing technical assistance tasks under 129 separate contracts with A.I.D. More than $158 million was involved in those contracts. Under the contract provisions, university personnel were in action all over the world performing vitally important tasks of education and technical assistance.

Nongovernmental Participation

Before examining more closely the relationship between A.I.D. and the universities, we must have a broader look at the technique of achieving public objectives through the collaboration of nongovernmental groups. There isn't one American in a hundred, perhaps a thousand, who has a clear grasp of the unique partnership that has evolved (and is still evolving) between public and private instrumentalities in this country. One still encounters, in some government officials, a gingerly approach to the use of outside resources—as though it were a somewhat radical thing to do. In fact,

it is a highly developed and heavily used technique. Our national defense today involves an extensive and flexible collaboration between the military services and a wide range of civilian agencies and individuals. Federal agencies concerned with science have developed similar collaborative arrangements with nongovernmental groups, particularly the universities. The long collaboration between the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges and universities has brought great benefits to all concerned.

Such collaboration with nongovernmental groups brings to bear on a national problem the full range of talent and institutional resources of our pluralistic society. But if collaboration is to be successful three cautions are in order: (1) The Federal agency involved must have a nucleus of first-class people capable of dealing with outside individuals and institutions on terms of professional equality. The notion that a Federal agency can let its direct-hire staff deteriorate and get all of its talent on contract is a dangerous delusion. (2) The relationship between government and the university must be defined in such a way as to preserve to each party independence of action in those functions that it must perform unimpeded. (3) The relationship must be such that each party not only can perform at its best but can gain added strength from its participation. Only under such circumstances will the government be able to justify its participation and the universities be able to put their best talent and resources at the disposal of government.

Short- Versus Long-Term Goals

If there is to be fruitful collaboration between A.I.D. and the universities, the relationship must be based primarily upon long-term goals. Among the numerous and varied programs administered by A.I.D. there are some which may properly be thought of as having short-term goals. But most technical assistance activities (which account for less than eight per cent of the total foreign aid budget for 1964-65) do not. Institution building is a slow process. Education is a slow process. The means for making the changes in cultural patterns necessary for development without destroying

important human values are only beginning to be understood. Years of patient investigation and trial of different methods will be required. If this nation continues to want a world in which free societies can prosper, the tasks of assistance in the developing areas will still be of lively concern when our great-grandchildren come of age. Some of the deprivations and deficiencies of these peoples will not be corrected in five years or even in five decades. Impatience won't change that hard fact.

This is not to say that *projects* should last for fifty years. We must move toward our long-term goals by tasks of far shorter duration, tasks subject to periodic evaluation and an agreed-upon terminal point. Many of these tasks will fit within the present notions of project duration, but others will not. Recent pressures for early termination of programs have been so great that some people have come to regard three years as normal duration for a technical assistance project, and seven years as just about the upper limit. Many tasks of technical assistance, particularly those carried out by the universities, are not only impaired but rendered meaningless by such a shortened time perspective.

Role of Host Government

The key party in the situation is neither A.I.D. nor the university but the host government. The problems of the developing nation cannot, in any fundamental sense, be solved from outside. It must ultimately save itself, develop itself, be itself. A.I.D., more than any of its predecessor agencies in foreign assistance, has explicitly faced up to this fact. It is not our purpose here to explore the complexities of the relationship. But the reader is asked to remember that A.I.D. and the universities are not solely concerned with their own interaction. The host government, and in most educational projects the host university, are lively and ever-present elements in the relationship.

II. The A.I.D.-University Relationship

Conflict and Misunderstanding

Just as A.I.D. has much to gain by tapping the rich resources of the university world, so the universities can gain a great deal by the relationship. We have already pointed out that the broadest and longest-term foreign policy objectives of the A.I.D. program are of deep interest to the universities. We must now point out that the universities have objectives of their own that are furthered through overseas activity of the sort carried on under A.I.D. contract. In order to educate their students for the world of today and tomorrow and to carry out their tasks of advancing human understanding, universities must relate themselves to the rest of the world. Science and scholarship have never confined themselves to national boundaries. Beyond their duty to their own constitutents, the commitment of the universities requires that they care about education wherever it is needed, and the advancement of learning wherever it is possible. But most universities do not command the resources to extend their interests so broadly. Accordingly, the partnership with A.I.D. offers to the universities the opportunity to enrich both teaching and research on the international side and to apply themselves to problems that might otherwise be beyond their reach.

In short, the collaboration of A.I.D. and the universities is important to both. Why, then, has it proved so irritating to both? We believe that the answer can be given in fairly specific terms, and this whole report is an attempt to do so.

The nature of the complaints is familiar enough. The universities say that A.I.D. lags far behind other agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research (to name only two), in its understanding of the universities. They say that A.I.D. doesn't grasp the nature and purposes of universities, doesn't know how to use them wisely, doesn't allow them to make the distinctive contribution that only they can make. If A.I.D. really understood these things, say the universities, the

Agency would take a more generous view of the research component in contracts; would not devise and administer contracts so rigid and detailed as to frustrate the purposes they are designed to further; would take a more generous view of the kind of contract provisions that would strengthen the university itself, and would not insist on measuring contract performance by externals and expecting precise evidence of short-term accomplishment.

A.I.D. responds that the universities make no attempt to understand its problems—its constant need to justify its actions to Congress, its inescapable responsibility for program decisions, its accountability to the taxpayer. It points out that universities have often acted irresponsibly—sending third-rate personnel overseas, neglecting the needs of the host country while they concentrate on what *they* want to do, engaging in aggressive tactics to get contracts, taking on tasks they are not equipped to do well, failing to put the full weight and resources of the university behind a contract and so on. Some A.I.D. officials add that no United States university ever willingly terminated a contract program, no matter how valid the reasons for doing so.

Though some of these complaints are exaggerated, they are not manufactured out of thin air. Both sides can produce *some* evidence to support their assertions. In this report we shall spend as little time as possible in a recital of criticisms and no time at all on the minor irritations that plague the relationship. We shall proceed directly to the major issues that must be faced if the relationship is to go forward on a sound basis.

The Complexity of the University's Role

Part of the difficulty in A.I.D.-university relations is that the proper role of the university has not been well understood. Some A.I.D. officials know little or nothing about the nature of the modern university, and a few of them still harbor a thoroughly anachronistic resentment over the intrusion of "eggheads" into practical affairs. Even those who respect the universities often do not know them well enough to demand and get the best that the universities have to offer.

It is a mistake to suppose that the difficulties arise from an inevitable

tension between government and university people. Other government agencies, particularly those concerned with science and technology, have forged an extremely fruitful alliance with the universities.

In extenuation of A.I.D. it must be said that the role of the university in overseas technical assistance presents certain unique complexities. That role is imperfectly understood even by the universities themselves. The university engaged in technical assistance overseas must function in terms of at least four sets of considerations:

1. It must perform in terms of its own tradition and integrity as a U. S. university. As such it has responsibilities that define the ways in which it must function.

2. Overseas it finds itself caught up in the complex business of abetting social change in a society that seeks (and resists) modernization. What it can accomplish, or even attempt, is governed in part by the social and cultural framework of the host country and by the dynamics of social change.

3. It also finds that it is working within the context of this nation's relations with the host country. Though it may strive to keep its activities insulated from official policy, it will always be affected by, and may in turn affect, the tone and character of official relations between the United States and the host country. It resists the notion that it has any immediate involvement in foreign policy, yet it never wholly escapes it.

4. Finally, the university recognizes that it is a member of an emerging world intellectual community—a world with its own traditions, requirements, and aspirations. Most university people hope that the emergence of such a community presages better understanding among nations, and would like to contribute to that outcome.

Each of these considerations places compelling requirements on the university—and since the requirements sometimes conflict, there is an understandable confusion of purpose. It would be presumptuous to suggest that we can point a clear path through this maze, but we can at least clarify some of the issues.

The Proper Role of the University

There has been much discussion of which overseas roles are appropriate to a university and which are not. We have emphasized that it must perform within the bounds of its own tradition and integrity. Beyond that it is not easy to lay down a general rule concerning "proper" university activities overseas. Each university must settle that question in terms of its own character. Our universities are so strikingly diverse in tradition, organization, attitudes and goals that it is impossible to generalize about them. (Indeed, that fact has been one of the major problems in preparing this report.)

It is fair to say, however, that the universities will probably achieve their most profound and lasting influence in working with their own kinds of institutions abroad—or, to put it more broadly, in working to strengthen institutions for human resource development. In this role everything contributes to their effectiveness. They feel at home, they know their role, and they care deeply about the consequences of what they do.

Virtually everyone in the university world would agree that there are certain short-term political tasks overseas that are incompatible with the university's role. For the university to undertake such tasks is inimical to its long-term effectiveness. With minor exceptions, the university must address itself to the achievement of long-term purposes: educational growth and human resource development, the advancement of knowledge, and the application of knowledge to basic problems.

Nor is the university at its best in piecemeal assignments. Even if its assignment is limited, it should see that assignment in the largest context, i.e., the whole state of educational and human resource development in the host country. That is why the university should be drawn as early as possible into consultation on the planning phase of programs in which it will eventually have a part. Only thus can it see its role in a meaningful way. (This is not to suggest, however, that A.I.D. should relinquish its responsibility for the key role in planning and programing.)

Degree of Autonomy of the University in the Field

There is an unresolved—and perhaps unresolvable—difference of views between A.I.D. officials and university people on the degree of autonomy to be enjoyed by the university in the field. University people characteristically argue for a large measure of separation between the university and the A.I.D. field mission. They point out the potential value of the university as a *nongovernmental* representative abroad. They quote Dean Rusk's penetrating comment on student exchange that if our student exchange programs were closely tied to foreign policy they could not make their full contribution to foreign policy. They emphasize that universities enjoy autonomy at home and should not lose it in the field.

The arguments are persuasive, but so are the responses. A.I.D. officials point out that university personnel enjoy autonomy at home in their teaching and research functions but not in their consulting role. In the latter role the ethical framework is not academic freedom but the delicately balanced obligations of a professional to his client. Furthermore, the argument goes, the university simply cannot, and indeed should not attempt to, escape involvement with the field mission. What the university does is inevitably seen as something that "the Americans are doing." And the university damages its argument, the critics say, by wanting it both ways. It wants complete autonomy, yet it wants to be a full partner when the planning is being done, and a full partner on decisions affecting its own area of activity.

It is not possible to resolve this conflict of views by an explicit and precise formula. The nearest we can come to such a formula is the assertion that universities functioning overseas should enjoy the maximum *reasonable* degree of autonomy. This may appear to invite endless debate over what is "reasonable," but in many overseas situations sensible A.I.D. officials and university people have shown that they *can* agree quite well as to its meaning. Most universities in the field have in fact enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy. Later when we discuss new forms of organization, we shall emphasize again the importance of university autonomy, not just from day-

to-day policy but from the whole pressure of a necessarily action-minded line organization.

Those who wish to debate further the issue of university autonomy in the field should bear in mind several considerations:

1. Everyone agrees that the United States Ambassador *must* have the final say concerning United States supported activities in the host country.

2. Everyone recognizes that in practice the university's autonomy varies with the size of the country. In very large countries the university's impact is modest and its freedom consequently greater. In very small countries where its impact is greater and where it is, willy-nilly, a substantial factor in the American "presence," it necessarily functions under greater constraints.

3. The autonomy a university enjoys depends on the nature of the project. Some tasks that the university undertakes overseas are so innocent of policy implications that the question of autonomy never arises. Other tasks are of a sort that have inevitable repercussions at the policy level.

4. There is evidence to suggest that in the long run the solution is less likely to come from formal attempts to define the relationship than from (a) a systematic attempt to staff A.I.D. field missions with men of high professional caliber, well equipped by background and training to deal with the universities, and (b) a similar attempt by universities to ensure that senior members of field parties be men of proven judgment and stability as well as professional competence.

Involvement of the Whole University

We speak of "university contracts," but the university as a whole has not really been involved in many of the overseas contracts. The university man overseas wants to feel (and act as though) he has the whole weight and dignity of his institution behind him, but he is often functioning virtually as an independent operator, and his university has committed itself only superficially. Functioning thus independently, he may or may not behave in a way that conforms with the integrity and responsibility of a great university. If the conception that A.I.D. officials have of what a university is and does

is somewhat distorted, they are not wholly at fault; the universities themselves have contributed to a blurring of the image.

When a university accepts a contract it should take it seriously, accept full responsibility, and put the whole institution behind the contract. In appraising a potential contractor, A.I.D. should estimate not only the strength of its resources but the depth of its commitment as a university. The evidence it should weigh might include the university's performance on past projects, its willingness to make appropriate faculty available, the extent to which it has set itself up administratively to handle overseas contracts, and the moves it is willing to make to integrate overseas and home campus activities.

The reason universities have sometimes failed to behave responsibly in these matters is due in part to the attitude that overseas activities are something quite separate from the main stream of the university's life and being, something exotic, exceptional, not of the warp and woof of the university's concern. Wherever this attitude persists it will continue to generate irresponsibility. If the university treasures its integrity then it has two choices: Get out of overseas activity entirely or recognize such activity as *an integral part of university life and work.* University officials negotiating on an overseas contract should be required, by A.I.D. and by their faculty colleagues, to set down specific plans for integration of the project into the regular work of the university. (There are exceptions, of course: Some highly specialized contracts do not lend themselves to such treatment.)

In universities where the professional schools are large, strong, and relatively autonomous, one can justify somewhat less involvement of the university as a whole. Integration of contract work and university program will take place chiefly within the school. But even here lack of communication within the university may diminish the effectiveness of the program in unfortunate—and unnecessary—ways. Universities that have provided for institution-wide coordination of their international programs have found clear benefits in doing so. The university need not be as severely fragmented as it often allows itself to be.

If the university is to function abroad as it does at home, then it will include research as a normal part of its contract activity. And wherever possible both research and consulting work will be linked to various forms of teaching. For example, professors going overseas will take graduate students with them, not only to work on the contract but to advance their graduate work through research and field experience. At the same time that the university commits itself for a major contract effort, it will undertake to build its library resources in the geographical area covered by the contract and in the development field generally. It will strengthen its curriculum in the same directions and will use faculty returning from overseas to create new and more relevant courses or to revise old courses. It will augment its faculty in the appropriate fields.

In short, in its overseas activities as well as at home, the university will function as a university and not merely as a pool of technical talent or an employment broker. It will remember that its unique role is not only to apply present knowledge but to *advance the state of knowledge,* not only to supply experts today but to *train the next generation of experts.*

All such requirements point again to the inescapably long-range nature of university participation in this field.

Though funds to do some of these things may be obtained from other sources, it is only reasonable that A.I.D. contribute its share. It is very much in A.I.D.'s interest that the university undertake such commitments.

If overseas projects do become an integral part of university life, assignments abroad will be much more attractive to faculty members. The individual going overseas will then be doing work as close to the university's central purpose as the one who stays home.

The University as a Resource

To the extent that the universities are a national resource, A.I.D. shares with all of government a responsibility not to weaken that resource. If it draws heavily on the universities (as it has in recent years), it must build strength back into the resource for future use. The Bell Report put it this way: "Government agencies share responsibility for seeing that research

and development financed at universities does not weaken these institutions or distort their functions which are so vital to the national interest." *

The main purpose in A.I.D.'s acting to strengthen the universities is not only to serve the national interest broadly conceived, but to enable these institutions to serve A.I.D. itself more effectively, now and in the future. In both the short and long run, A.I.D. itself will benefit if the universities gain in their total capacity to deal with the international dimension of their interests.

Some A.I.D. officials hold the view that the need to strengthen the university as a resource is necessarily in competition with the need to assist foreign countries directly. But it is not a question of "helping the foreign country versus helping the United States university." In these matters the U. S. university is the *means* of helping the foreign country. So the question is: Should we spend all the money in an attempt to solve today's problem (which at best can be only partially solved) or spend part of the money improving our capacity to solve tomorrow's problem?

If the medical profession had insisted that every dollar spent in strengthening modern medical education, technology, and science was a dollar unjustly diverted from the care of patients, we would still be treating fevers with leeches. The universities have been in the technical assistance business for some time now, and they would be doing far better today if we had begun ten years ago to strengthen them systematically to do the job that needs doing. A number of government agencies concerned with other areas of endeavor have found that such strengthening of the universities pays big dividends.

Of course it is the responsibility of the university, not of A.I.D., to take the initiative in strengthening its international capabilities. The university needs help from A.I.D., but it can also turn to other sources of support for such strengthening.

---

* Senate Document No. 94 (87th Congress, Second Session), Report to the President on Government Contracting for Research and Development, May 17, 1962, p. 17.

What must the university do to strengthen its international capability? First of all it must, as we have said, recognize the task as one involving the whole institution. It will want to develop the international aspects of the curriculum in many departments and schools of the university. It will encourage research on a whole range of problems relevant to development and to international affairs generally. It will develop its language departments and its library holdings in relevant fields.

Universities undertaking a variety of overseas activities will need to make one or another kind of administrative provision for these activities. And universities being what they are, no two of them will accomplish this in the same way. But however they go at it, some kind of central administrative concern for these activities is essential. Fiscal procedures must be appropriate to the handling of government funds. Personnel practices can do much to facilitate, or impede, overseas assignments: university-wide personnel regulations should be such as to encourage, not penalize, overseas service. In short, if overseas projects are to be successful they require the solid backing of the administration.

Almost every qualified expert who has examined these problems has recommended that the university take an additional step, namely to increase its staff in certain departments so that it can take on overseas assignments without damage to its homebase functions. We heartily endorse this recommendation, but emphasize that it can only be done if all concerned face up to the serious implications. If the university adds to its tenure faculty, it makes an unequivocal commitment to the individuals involved. Someone has to put hard cash back of that commitment.

At some universities a special dean of international programs has been appointed. This officer can be an extremely effective force for the strengthening of the university's international dimension.

But all such discussion of central administrative measures must end with the reminder that in universities power resides in the departments and schools. Enthusiasm and commitment at this level is essential to successful development of the university's international capability.

What A.I.D. Can Do to Help

It is time that A.I.D. examined significant measures employed to strengthen the universities by such agencies as the Department of Agriculture, the National Institutes of Health, the Office of Education and others.

The National Science Foundation provides institutional grants on the following formula: 100 per cent of the first $10,000 of applicable NSF grants to that institution and a graduated percentage of grant amounts in excess of $10,000, subject to a maximum award of $150,000. The money can be used for scientific research, research training, teacher training, graduate instruction, or library acquisitions. It cannot be used for general instructional costs nor for activities outside the scientific fields. The National Institutes of Health provides even more generous grants. For a number of years, a variety of observers have been recommending that A.I.D. find some means of providing comparably broad, multi-purpose grants to strengthen selected universities as resource bases for the development field.

The National Defense Education Act language and area study centers represent another approach to the problem of strengthening the universities. Some centers were established *de novo*. Others were already in existence but were greatly strengthened. The NDEA programs respect the autonomy of the universities and enjoy excellent relations with them.

The NIH approached a number of universities with the proposal that they establish overseas research centers, and five such centers are now in operation. About half of the money provided by NIH is spent at the home campus of the university. A.I.D. might well examine the possibility of establishing a few overseas research centers with strong home-campus ties.

In short, drawing on the experience of other government agencies, A.I.D. has at its disposal a variety of means to help those well-qualified universities that want to develop themselves as powerful resources in development work. Each university might specialize in certain ways—either in terms of function or geographical area. Such centers could be called upon by A.I.D., by any other government agency, by private groups, or by foreign governments.

III. Participant Training

An important part of any technical assistance program is to bring individuals from the host country to the United States for so-called "participant training." When effectively planned and carried out, such training is a powerful ingredient in the total developmental strategy.

We understand that the whole program of participant training is under review by the Agency at this time. We shall limit our discussion to those participants who are served by the universities. Of those who come to the universities, we shall be concerned mainly with those coming as a result of an overseas contract of the university, but also to some extent with the so-called non-contract participant.

Obviously to review carefully the situation of participant trainees on our campuses would take us into the whole foreign student problem, and that subject has been dealt with in other reports. In these pages we shall not stray far from matters of special relevance to participant training.

To begin with, we must emphasize the need to develop a consensus among (a) the participant himself, (b) the U. S. university, (c) A.I.D. and (d) the host government as to the rationale and specific objectives for the training program. The participant must know what to expect or to hope for. (For example, whether he will be allowed to remain long enough to get a degree should be clarified in advance.) The U. S. university must know what it is committed to. None of the four parties should have a false conception of what the program can or will yield.

A considerable amount of preparatory effort must go into a good participant training program. To handle groups of participants, it is important that the United States university be given more adequate lead time than it often receives today. It needs time to familiarize itself with the total planned A.I.D. effort in the host country, thereby placing its own efforts in the perspective of the total development plan. It needs time to design special training courses, to plan field experiences where necessary, and to assign cer-

tain trainees to other more suitable institutions when appropriate. Obviously, such extensive preparations will not always be necessary.

The single most important criterion for selection of the A.I.D. participant should be the positive impact he is likely to make when he returns home and takes his place in the work for which he has been trained. This highly focused basis for selection is the respect in which the A.I.D. participant differs most clearly from the general run of foreign students. While occasional compromises may have to be made, it is important that extraneous pressures on the selection of participants be minimized wherever possible.

The participant's command of English should not be a major factor in his selection, but once selected he should receive intensive language instruction. While it is preferable that he have a reasonable grasp of English before he arrives, this is not always possible, and intensive training courses should be available here as well as overseas. In these efforts, cooperation among the Department of State, A.I.D., USIA, the Department of Defense, and the Peace Corps is highly appropriate since all are concerned with the problem.

Despite the fact that they average 29 years of age, participants normally require much the same services that are desirable for all our foreign students. On campuses where a large number of A.I.D. participants exists, some reasonably senior official in the university administration should concern himself with the educational and social welfare of these individuals. The situation is complicated today. The "campus coordinator" concerns himself with participants coming to the campus in connection with an overseas contract of the university. But there may be an even greater number of noncontract participants on the same campus, some of whom have their own advisers. And then there is the "foreign student adviser" who concerns himself with all foreign students. Without recommending an administrative solution to this tangle, we would urge that somehow *all* participants receive some measure of attention. They have much to gain, for example, by frequent individual and collective consultation on substantive matters as well as opportunities for counseling, hospitality, and extracurricular activities. There is ample evi-

dence that extracurricular experiences and adjustment may greatly enhance or detract from the training experience. Yet the extracurricular element in participant programs has rarely received the attention it deserves.

Opportunities to visit Americans in their homes and to travel within the United States contribute to the more comprehensive experience of the participant. Equally important is the inclusion of wives in the financial budget for certain participants, especially those who are expected to stay in the United States longer than the school year.

Since the trainees come for a great variety of substantive programs, it is difficult to offer any generalizations on the content of training. A good deal of flexibility should be maintained with respect to both substance and duration of training. It is not always possible to predict what will be best for those trainees until the training is under way.

Perhaps the most frequently noted deficiency of present university participant programs is that trainees too often receive training that is only partly relevant to their needs on returning home. In some cases this stems from a failure of the university to understand those needs. More often it reflects the difficulty and expense of providing special training programs for participants. The foreign student in general and the A.I.D. participant in particular cost more than the U.S. student to train. Fortunately, the abundant reservoir of American goodwill that manifests itself in family hospitality and in professional in-training opportunities can be tapped at no expense to university or participant. Even so, it costs more to educate the participant. The fact that the university should tailor special programs and render a multitude of services to A.I.D. participants ought to be frankly recognized.

Another step A.I.D. might take to make more feasible the setting up of special programs would be to go much farther than it has to date in grouping students with similar needs (though perhaps from different countries) at the same university.

On its part, the university must accept the enlarged responsibility that devolves on it by virtue of the fact that the participant comes from another culture and has specific training requirements.

IV. Research

We still know all too little about the processes of modernization. We need research and lots of it, basic and applied, in the field and on the home campus. A.I.D. has a legitimate role, indispensable to the fulfillment of its larger purposes, in the development of new knowledge and the application of that knowledge to development assistance activities. The Agency now has a research program under able leadership; it should support that program vigorously.

Here are what we regard as the elements of a sound A.I.D. research policy and program.

Program of Research Grants and Contracts

The heart of the Agency's research activities should be the program of contracts and grants to universities and other appropriate research institutions—and this program should be supported at a very much higher level than it is today. Following patterns well developed by agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the program should stimulate and support research on the development process and on aspects of agriculture, conservation and the use of natural resources, public health and nutrition, hydrology and the other natural and social sciences that have special relevance to development.

One cannot emphasize too strongly the role that systematic study, analysis and experimentation must play in the evolution of improved methods of development assistance. We have a lot to learn. Research should address itself not only to the discovery of new knowledge, but to the devising, designing, and testing of new procedures and materials in technical cooperation and to the analytical study—for purposes of improved decision-making —of development assistance activities and their consequences.

In the nation's military and space efforts a minimum of 10 per cent of the total allocation is devoted to exploratory research and innovation, and a large portion of this is done by the universities. We are not suggesting

that A.I.D. match that figure, but we strongly urge that it recognize the compelling requirement for systematic exploration and experimentation to improve the whole process of development assistance.

The Agency should not hesitate to support research that does not have immediate, visible utility. Basic research on social processes may provide the quickest path to new insights into the development process. And the Agency should adopt a wide, rather than a restricted, framework for the kinds of basic research its funds might assist. No one can foretell what outcomes of prime utility will emerge from work on such subjects as political development, the role of education in economic development, the physiology and nutrient requirements of tropical plants, and so on.

Project-Related Research

In addition, we believe that the Agency should include a research component in many of its university contracts. Government agencies dealing with the sciences have long since recognized that if they want first-class university people to work on government projects they must give some thought to the provision of research funds. To eliminate the research component from the life of a good university man is to alter his role and to ask him to be something less than himself. It is not in his nature to limit himself to the crisis to be solved today. He wants to understand the underlying problems so that he can meet tomorrow's crises more wisely.

In narrowly defined or short-term contracts the provision for research might be omitted. In broader and longer-term projects, provisions for research should often include not only applied but basic research.

In-House Research

The Agency should have a small but strong in-house research and analysis unit staffed with first-class people. This unit would (a) conduct analyses and systems research related to specific development problems, and (b) undertake surveys and evaluations at the request of the Administrator. The

Agency is seriously deficient today in arrangements for evaluation of its programs.

What the University Can Do

In the above paragraphs we have concentrated on what A.I.D. can do to improve its policy and practices relating to research. But there is much that the universities themselves ought to do. Though the modernization of the developing nations is recognized by discerning people as one of the great challenges of our day, many university departments in fields relevant to development give it very little attention. The first requirement of this field from a research standpoint is that more first-class minds turn their attention to it.

One of the characteristics of much research on development is that it is interdisciplinary in nature, and in a good many academic departments the resistance to such boundary-crossing is formidable.

Universities have always seen it as one of their primary responsibilities to create the conditions and circumstances in which their scholars can do creative work. Thus they build and maintain multimillion dollar research libraries, nuclear accelerators, and astronomical observatories. If they face up to their comparable responsibilities in the field of development, they might create important development research centers on their own campuses and research stations overseas. And they might allot special funds for travel, supplies, and field assistance to faculty members with overseas research interests.

The most important single fact about development research today is that there isn't enough of it. If it were increased by a factor of ten it would be a more appropriate response to the challenge of development. A.I.D. should increase very substantially its own commitment in research. And the universities interested in development should make concerted efforts to bring other sources of funds, governmental and nongovernmental, into the productive support of development research.

V. University Contracts and Contract Administration

Selection of Contractors

In the past, selection of contractors has too often been haphazard and based on chance encounters. There has been no adequate philosophy or strategy governing the choices.

How can we improve the process? Lest we make hasty analogies to the procedures used by other government agencies, it must be emphasized that A.I.D. faces a more complex problem than most agencies in choosing recipients for its funds. When NIH makes a research grant, it judges the competence of the investigator and soundness of the research plan—and that is that. In the case of A.I.D., the work the university is chosen to do must fit into a country plan and into the more general outlines of foreign policy; and the university and the project must be acceptable to the host government and host university. Beyond the competence of the project leader, A.I.D. must appraise certain strengths of the university itself.

We have already made the point that A.I.D. should regard every contract as a means of strengthening the university as well as accomplishing a job abroad. So it must not only ask, "Can this university do the job?" but, "Are there particular advantages to the national interest in strengthening this university as a future resource?" In order to make such judgments, the Agency must have a knowledge of this nation's total university resources for development work, so that it can know where any particular university fits into the picture.

Lacking such a framework for its judgments, the Agency has in the past tended to let contracts pile up in the most obvious instititutions.*

---

* As of December 31, 1963 there were 72 universities with 129 contracts. Of these universities, 7 had a total of 37 of the contracts.

Selection Criteria

Here are some criteria which the agency might keep in mind in selecting a university:

1. To what extent has the university developed its resources in the international field generally—faculty, curriculum, research, library, interdisciplinary programs?

2. What is the caliber of the faculty in key fields? Relevant fields will of course vary with the nature of the contract and may include—among others—agriculture, economics, public administration, medicine, nursing, public health, sociology, cultural anthropology, business administration, education, and all fields of engineering.

3. Has the faculty shown any inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work so essential to development assistance? Are there areas study programs or interdisciplinary research teams?

4. What are the research resources of the university in fields relevant to development, and particularly in those fields relating to the problem at hand?

5. Has the university set itself up administratively to handle overseas projects? Do these administrative arrangements have adequate roots at the faculty and departmental level, on the one hand, and adequate top-level backing on the other?

6. Has the university (or the part of the university most directly involved in the contract) had relevant earlier experience in overseas work? How much experience, and what was the quality of its performance?

7. What is the quality of personnel assigned to this specific project? Has the university (and its departments) made it possible for faculty members to participate without suffering in terms of career advancement?

8. What is the degree of the university's commitment to the projects? This is not merely a matter of the university's saying, "We're terribly interested." Its commitment can be partly measured by judging the extent to which it has already developed its resources in the international field generally and in the fields relevant to the specific contract. Its future intentions

should be explored in some detail. What will it do to strengthen its resources further as the contract proceeds? How does it plan to integrate the overseas project with its home-base operations? What arrangements will it make to insure feedback from the field experience into curriculum and research on the campus?

Requirements for an Effective Selection Process

It has been suggested that we correct the deficiencies of recent selection procedures by establishing an orderly, systematic and explicit set of procedures and criteria. But we believe that any such attempt to formalize or explicitly define the selection procedure would tie the Agency hand and foot. The solution to the selection problem is to state certain general considerations (as we have above) and then to make certain that the people doing the selection are adequately equipped to do an intelligent job. This means, first of all, that they must be people who *know* the universities and know quality when they see it. The second requirement is that they have a thorough grasp of the nature of the job to be done overseas. The third requirement is that they have access to (or develop on their own) a comprehensive view of the *total U.S. resources* (university and other) to do the job. The fourth requirement is that there be instrumentalities (such as the Overseas Educational Service or university consortia) through which the resources of small institutions can be tapped. It is the absence of any such instrumentality that makes A.I.D. turn to the few great universities with resources sufficiently rich and varied to mount operations on their own.

The people doing the selecting will of course seek outside advice where necessary, but the Agency cannot lean too heavily on outside advice in such selection. Other agencies have found that the advisory panel is an excellent device for helping to select individual research projects but A.I.D. must make judgments on institutions, and that is much harder for an advisory panel of university people to do wisely and fairly.

Those responsible for selection will not postpone their appraisal of individual universities until these institutions appear to be logical possibili-

ties for a specific contract. They will be in continuous contact with all universities that are possible future contractors. When the time comes that they must select (or reject) a specific institution, they will then do so in terms of ripened acquaintance with the university in question and a broad knowledge of other possibilities.

Although the nature of this report has led us to discuss here only the selection of university contracts, we do not intend to suggest a diminished emphasis on other means of procuring services, e.g., arrangements with other governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

Contract Administration

Conflicts resulting from contract administration have been the most persistent irritants in the A.I.D.-university relationship. If we were to catalogue the tales of woe that stem from years of such controversy, one would wonder how anything at all had been accomplished. Universities accuse A.I.D. of undue rigidity, incomprehensible delays, unsympathetic attitudes, and excessive and costly emphasis on small details. A.I.D. points out that universities have at times behaved irresponsibly and with little recognition of the requirements of accountability under which a government agency must function.

Many problems in contract administration do not stem from the contracting process and device but from broader aspects of the relationship: confused definition of appropriate roles and purposes, incomplete commitment of host country leaders, short-run view of the aid program, budgetary and organization difficulties of the agency, and so on. But after due attention is given to these broader aspects, one must face the fact that certain specific improvements should be made in the contract administration and in the contract itself.

The most important feature of the whole process is the spirit and understanding prevailing at the outset. Both parties must achieve a relatively thorough understanding of what is to be done and of the nature of the commitment each is making. Each must understand what the other party to

the contract can and cannot do. If understanding is high at the outset among the three or more main parties to the effort, the contract will lead to a satisfying program with a minimum of friction. To this end, precontract discussions should be full and unhurried. Visits to the field by university people have proved valuable. Precontract visits to the campus by A.I.D. people—too infrequent today—not only improve the contract under discussion but help the Agency in its necessary task of getting to know the universities better.

Within the Agency there are two vitally important requirements for improvement of the contract process: (1) There must be close and continuous teamwork between the contract officer and A.I.D. professional persons concerned with the contract. The importance of such teamwork can hardly be overestimated. (2) A.I.D. contract specialists handling university contracts should be individuals who have had experience in such dealings with the universities.

Should conflict-of-interest consideration rule out a potential contractor if he has already done the precontract survey or feasibility study? We do not believe so. We believe that A.I.D. should have nothing to do with a contractor whose professional integrity it doubts. Given that integrity, there are great advantages in the contracting university doing the precontract studies. And in any case, we believe that A.I.D. should be so staffed as to give the precontract study careful professional monitoring and to form an independent judgment. In fact A.I.D. might make a consistent practice of supplying a member of the survey team for the precontract study.

Contract Flexibility

We have received overwhelming evidence that the universities regard past (and to a lesser extent, present) contract procedures as excessively rigid and detailed. If the preliminary negotiations create an environment of mutual confidence and mutual understanding of goals, the contract itself can be a relatively simple and flexible document. It can state the broad goals of the cooperative effort, any special understandings reached during the nego-

tiations, the minimum specifications of personnel clearance, amendment and other necessary processes and the budget limitations to be followed. Detail can be left to guidance manuals elaborating on standard and "boiler plate" provisions.

In this connection, it is time to review the "standard contract provisions" that were developed by a joint university-A.I.D. endeavor in 1957. The detailed provisions evolved at that time were helpful for a while in eliminating recurring difficulties in the contract system. They should now be revised and rewritten in line with experience of recent years and in the light of the general recommendations of this report. It would be well to plan a biennial review of these provisions so that they would be kept up to date.

At the same time, A.I.D. should maintain an up-to-date guidance manual on university contract practices. Revised as needed and widely available, such a manual should help simplify operations and add to the ease of contract relations.

It is always necessary to have sufficient flexibility written into the contract to permit easy shifts in timetables and goals as the field situation requires. Similarly, it is important to provide an easy means of amending the contract, since the conditions under which these programs operate are frequently unforeseeable.

Three-year contracts are now the rule. But the three-year term has little or no relation to the realities of overseas development. Most-A.I.D.-university projects will be planned for substantially longer periods. We have already stressed the importance of long-term efforts on the part of the university. It would be highly desirable to recognize this fact by arranging longer-term financing and contractual commitments.

The contracting university should be responsible for performance with a minimum of supervision. Semiannual progress reports by the university should be continued as a basis for reviewing progress and problems. Week-to-week contact between A.I.D. and the university would be relatively slight although there would be an unimpeded flow of information, some discussion

of program plans, transmission of some documents (personnel records, occasional proposed amendments, research reports).

Personnel Clearance

There is no issue more sensitive than that of personnel clearance. It generates as much or more controversy than any other question in the university-A.I.D. relationship. There are two aspects of the problem that concern the universities and A.I.D.—security clearance and professional clearance.

Clearance for professional competence is much the less complicated issue. The university should be the sole judge of professional competence. As a matter of fact, A.I.D. has almost always accepted that principle, but the few occasions when it has not have created great friction.

Security clearance is a more difficult problem. All personnel going overseas on A.I.D. funds must undergo *some sort* of security clearance. This requirement is written into the legislation, and we have found no one who seriously believes that it can or will be eliminated. But within the limits of that reality, there are substantial improvements that can be made. A high percentage of university contract work overseas need not involve any access to classified information and can properly be treated as nonsensitive. *When this is possible it should be done,* and it can be done by administrative decision within A.I.D. It will permit drastic acceleration of clearance procedures for most university personnel. It will save money, lighten the load on the A.I.D. security office, and eliminate a major source of friction. Interminable delays in security clearance for nonsensitive jobs are inexcusable.

The issue of security clearance raises questions that go far beyond the scope of this report, and indeed beyond the jurisdiction of A.I.D. It is a problem the universities face in dealing with all government agencies. Many university people and government officials hold diametrically opposite views on these issues, and both sides would profit by a more systematic airing of differences than has been customary to date. We urge more candid debate on these matters.

Compensation

The present arrangement permits the university sufficient leeway to pay its faculty adequately for overseas service. A pattern of annualization of salaries, modest overseas increments, plus allowances and differentials conforming to normal government practice has evolved as an acceptable formula.

Provisions for determining compensation, including fringe benefits, should be standard (though obviously salaries cannot be standardized), and with the guidance of a contractor's manual, should pose few administrative problems.

Indirect Costs

University contracts are nonprofit, and indirect costs are reimbursable according to an accepted formula and audit procedure. But there has been ambiguity in interpretation of policy, so that the issue flares up from time to time.

Contracts in the past have included only provisional rates for indirect costs. New legislation now permits A.I.D. to negotiate fixed rates, and this may eliminate much of the controversy. If a contract can clearly specify the rate of indirect charges, based on cost studies and businesslike negotiations, the irritating problems that so often arise later may be minimized. Both parties having agreed at the outset, there would be little cause for wrangling after the fact.

It would help if there were better understanding of what is meant by indirect costs in a university, nonprofit contract. If uniform guidelines were available on the definition of direct and indirect costs, and if precontract discussions brought out clearly the manner in which the rate of indirect costs is to be calculated, acrimonious charges and countercharges would be less likely to arise. The experience of other agencies can be useful in laying down such guidelines.

Restriction on Publication

In recent years A.I.D. has placed no general restrictions on scholarly publication, but we have had some indication that restrictions in connection with

specific contracts continue to crop up. University personnel should be free to publish scholarly or scientific writings growing out of their contract experience. There should be no requirements for the formal clearance of such writings. The only limitations on what is said should be the limitations imposed by the writer's own professional integrity.

The one obvious qualification to these statements relates to those instances in which security is involved. But security in its strict sense (rather than what might be called its "extended bureaucratic sense," i.e., all information the divulging of which might create some mild embarassment) is not a major factor in most university contracts. In the vast flow of incidents, irritations, and complaints that were brought to our attention in the course of the study, there was not one instance of a significant breach of security through publication.

The problem that publication poses for A.I.D. is not one of security but of discretion. Here again we note that the university contractor is subject in some measure to the ethics governing the professional man's relations to his client—a relationship that imposes considerable discretion in publication.

The capacity of the university man to exercise such discretion is not untested. University people today are involved in a vast number of professional relationships requiring discretion, and they have not proved irresponsible. But A.I.D. faces special problems in this connection. The faculty member who exercises admirable discretion when surrounded by his colleagues at home may be far from discreet (e.g., in making pronouncements outside his sphere of competence) when he is halfway around the world. And the consequences of such lapses overseas may be far more severe than at home.

In short, just as the university must insist on the scholar's freedom to publish, so it must insist that its overseas representatives behave responsibly.

Activities Funded Under the Contract

If A.I.D. asks a university to take on an important assignment, it should provide funds to do the whole job thoroughly. It should recognize, for example, that the university needs time and money to prepare for an

important job—time to find replacements for its own faculty members participating; time to recruit additional team members from other universities; time and money for background research, feasibility studies, language training, and orientation of faculty going overseas. The university should also have funds to insure proper feedback of experience gained in the field. The lessons learned from the experience should not go unrecorded. Many of these lessons are only available in the minds of faculty participants, and if no funds are to be had, that's where they may remain. If time and money are available, these people will do what comes naturally for university faculty—convert their insights into new curricula, research, articles, and books. Such a harvest should be part of any well-conceived project. Finally, the university should have funds to provide proper administrative support for the project at home base.

Loans as a Means of Funding University Contracts

Recently it has been suggested that university participation in technical assistance be financed through loans to the foreign governments involved (which would then deal directly with the universities). There is an increasing tendency throughout the aid program for Congress to appropriate funds for loans rather than grants. It may be that as time goes on loans will continue to grow in political acceptability, even though they are "soft" loans—extended at very low rates of interest and repayable over many years.

U.S. universities are apprehensive of the political, economic, and legal questions which they fear might arise in direct dealings with foreign governments and universities. A.I.D. officials say that these worries are not justified. They say that the relationship can be set up in such a way as to eliminate those complications that are most feared by the universities.

There are moves under way to experiment with loans as a basis for university contracts, and these may teach us something. In the meantime the subject presents more questions than answers. Accordingly, this report cannot go beyond urging that more careful study be given the problem.

A few universities should be encouraged to experiment with loan arrangements.

If it does prove feasible to fund university-based technical assistance through development loans, considerably greater resources than are now available through grants would be at the disposal of the universities—not only from A.I.D. but from other lending agencies.

VI. Personnel and Training

It is not easy to talk about the inadequacies of a personnel system without seeming to do injury to good men who are a part of the system. We do not wish the following comments to reflect on the many very capable men and women in the Agency. Had it not been for the help of extremely able officials in many parts of the Agency, this report could never have been written.

Recruiting Problems

A.I.D. and its predecessor agencies have experienced consistent difficulty in recruiting and retaining men of appropriate qualifications. The problem has been almost as serious in contract personnel as in direct-hire. The problem has been intensified, of course, by the extreme organizational instability and fierce Congressional criticism to which the Agency has been subjected in recent years.

Part of the difficulty, however, is that A.I.D. still has some hard lessons to learn in attracting able professionals and creating an environment in which they can function effectively. It simply cannot compete with agencies and institutions, in and out of government, that have learned those difficult lessons.

All categories of high talent manpower are in short supply. And the problem will get worse before it gets better. In the decade ahead the universities will face extreme difficulties in finding qualified teachers. It is possible to argue that they cannot and should not compound these difficulties by engaging in contract work for A.I.D. We are acutely aware of the problems facing the universities. But we must hope that, in the national interest, they will somehow find the personnel to do both jobs.

Even if there were no competing pressures, there would be a serious shortage of men qualified for development work. There are just not enough men in existence who are qualified in this field, so part of the

problem is to produce more such experts. A.I.D. has a responsibility to contribute to that end.

The aversion of most Americans to overseas service is well known. Any agency with overseas personnel must cope with problems of living conditions, medical care, availability of schools, and the like. And it must provide incentives for overseas service—retirement credit, salary, and fringe benefit incentives. Overseas service should be considered as a credit for positions anywhere in the federal service.

Despite over fifteen years of activity in foreign aid, the government still lacks any adequate personnel system in this field. Its failure to offer adequate *career* opportunities in this field is a grave handicap in recruiting and an injustice to the good men now employed. Whether a man is going overseas for two years on contract or for longer on direct-hire, he wants to know what sense it makes in the whole perspective of his career. In a day when the ablest professionals spend a good portion of their lives training themselves cumulatively for complex and specialized work, a man wants to know what his efforts are leading to.

The failure to develop an adequate career service in this field fits in with a general conception of foreign aid as a short-term venture. Most technical assistance, certainly that portion involving the universities, is anything but short term. It is our contribution to a tremendous task that will not end in this decade, indeed not in this century.

A Career Service

There is an unspoken assumption in many quarters, particularly among university people, that whenever A.I.D. really needs talent all it has to do is write another contract. This is a grave mistake. A.I.D. cannot intelligently administer an extensive contract system unless the best of its direct-hire personnel are able to deal with development problems at the same professional level as the best university people. It *must* be in a position to bring first-class, intramural judgment to bear on a question. Furthermore, its relations with the universities will never be established on a sound

basis until it has on its own staff the caliber of professional personnel who can deal with university people on equal terms. That is a lesson that the Office of Naval Research, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies learned long ago.

We believe that in order to solve its personnel problem A.I.D. must create two kinds of career service: a small, permanent professional service, and a larger, more heterogeneous reserve force. Let us look first at the permanent service.

It would be entered (both laterally and at the bottom) by those who intend to make a full lifetime career of service in the field of social, economic and political development. They would be essentially the planners, managers, administrators, and organizers of governmentally assisted development activities (not just technical assistance). Because their backgrounds would often be in one of the technical fields (education, engineering or agriculture), they might be division chiefs for a particular technical service. Normally at senior levels they would serve as chiefs or deputy chiefs of mission, or as comptrollers or administrative officers.

The career service described here should be "compatible" in all respects with the Foreign Service. The two should have comparable policies and practices and should interchange personnel freely. The latter is particularly important. We doubt that the new service can be set up as it should be set up without new legislative authority, and we urge that such authority be sought.

The Foreign Development Reserve

Equally serious attention must be given to the career problems of individuals who accept temporary assignments overseas. It is becoming increasingly clear that the work of development assistance cannot be done by randomly recruited individuals who consider their overseas service a brief interlude in a career devoted to something else. Even the personnel who go overseas on temporary assignments must take the commitment seriously and prepare themselves carefully. And they should be individuals who plan to return

repeatedly throughout their careers. Only thus can we have available the cumulative experience that such jobs demand.

But no man can undertake repeated assignments overseas unless they are an integral part of his professional development and advancement. Since the traditional university structure does not lend itself to such a career pattern, the success of the Reserve will depend on the willingness of the universities to invent some new arrangements.

Such arrangements must take account of the problems facing the man who accepts an assignment overseas. Before he agrees to accept an assignment halfway around the world, he would like some assurance of job re-entry without prejudice on his return; he would like to think that those at home regard the overseas experience as a legitimate means of advancing his career, and that he will not be penalized by missing promotion or salary increments, by getting lower compensation or lower fringe benefits while overseas, or by being out-of-pocket for moving expenses, care of dependents, and the like.

The proposed Reserve would be a framework into which professionals of many kinds would fit for the purpose of temporary overseas service—persons who have their primary careers in the universities and colleges, in business organizations, in nonprofit organizations and even, perhaps, in agencies of the federal government other than the State Department or A.I.D. Membership in the Reserve would carry with it a clear commitment to service abroad—two years in every eight, perhaps, the frequency depending on the employment and career patterns prevailing in the individual reservist's own field and organization.

Today all too many contract personnel go overseas with no previous experience, stay just long enough to begin to learn their jobs and then return home, never to work abroad again. It is essential that we have a large reservoir of trained and experienced people who have been on such assignments before and have already accomplished much of the necessary learning (e.g., knowledge of the language, familiarity with problems of operating overseas, a "feel" for the pace and style of another society).

Such people would have an intimate knowledge of the operations of A.I.D. itself and of what was going on in the whole field of development assistance. They could move with competence and rapidity into particular overseas assignments.

The success of the reserve principle would depend on finding ways to make membership prestigious and advantageous. In return for the commitment to successive periods of temporary service, reservists should be offered meaningful and tangible benefits. They should be assured of periodic opportunities for overseas service and given special preference in selection for assignments.

Planning

So far we have confined ourselves to discussing one major element in a wise personnel strategy—the development of career services. If we step back and ask ourselves what would be *all* of the elements in an appropriate and comprehensive personnel strategy, it is clear that we must begin the list with planning. The agency must arrive at some projections of personnel needs. It must know roughly what kinds of people in what numbers are going to be required to do the job that needs to be done over the next decade or two. Such planning is a very imperfect art, and projections of personnel needs are often highly speculative—but a carefully studied guess will be far better than nothing. The attempt to project needs should cover both permanent and temporary personnel.

Survey of Personnel Resources

The agency must arrive at better understanding of the total personnel resources available to it in this country. Most of the recruiting today is all too haphazard. The agency needs to know where to go to get the kinds of people it wants. It should look into the personnel resources available in smaller universities, independent liberal arts colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutes. It should look into the possibilities in other non-governmental areas—industrial laboratories, museums and research institutions of various

sorts. It has never *adequately* explored the possibility of tapping the reservoir of 2,300,000 federal personnel. It has never adequately examined the possibilities and legal complications of tapping the reservoir of state and local employees.

Education and Training

The Agency cannot assume that the professionals it hires know very much about the complex tasks of development. Even men with high professional qualifications have a lot to learn when they enter this difficult field.

The Agency must take this reality into account into account in two ways: (1) it must work with the universities to produce a greater supply of adequately trained professionals for the future; (2) it must provide more in-house training than do other agencies—rather than less, as it does today. (A.I.D direct-hire professionals spend less than five per cent of their career time in training, as against five per cent for the Foreign Service and twelve per cent for the military forces.)

The universities have not done anything like an adequate job of producing men with solid professional preparation for work in some aspect of development, and they must apply themselves to this task. Their progress will be more rapid and their programs sounder if they are assured of the active interest and sympathy of the government agency most directly involved in that complex field.

The task of the university is complicated in that "development" is neither a profession nor a discipline. It is a problem area in which members of many professions or disciplines may choose to specialize. Thus graduate work relevant to development may take place in any of a number of departments or professional schools, and wherever it is based it will necessarily have a strong interdisciplinary character. Some departments such as economics or political science may wish to design Ph.D. (or two-year M.A.) programs for the individual who seeks to specialize in the development field. Professional schools should include courses relating to development for those students who wish to include that element in their preparation.

How can the Agency be helpful? If it does not wish to follow the precedent of various other government agencies in supporting graduate programs directly, it can at least make provision in its university contracts for graduate students to accompany their major professors overseas. And it could provide internships for pre- and postdoctoral students. In this connection, it must be recognized that the Agency's research programs are a training ground for individuals who may later be useful in operations. (This has been the experience in military and space Research and Development.)

Another point at which the Agency can effectively enter the picture is in providing funds for predeparture training and orientation programs for university personnel going overseas.

As for the in-service aspects of training, the Agency should examine the experience of the Foreign Service Institute and explore the possibility of designing its own introductory courses for new recruits and its own mid-career courses. Any such in-service training program should be conceived and designed as an integral part of a carefully planned career development system.

Much would be gained by a free exchange of personnel between A.I.D. and the universities. At present this is made difficult by incompatible insurance, retirement, and other fringe benefits arrangements, as well as by attitudes on the part of both parties which militate against such arrangements. Someone should do a careful study of the steps which could be taken to minimize the obstacles and maximize the advantages of such interchange. One step which could be taken almost immediately would be to make more extensive and systematic use of the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act and the training provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act which permit A.I.D. personnel to spend a year in academic institutions.

Another means of stimulating a two-way flow of people and ideas between government and the academic world has been used by the United States Geological Survey. Using the "When Actually Employed" (WAE) basis for retaining personnel, it has kept several hundred persons—many of them faculty and graduate students—on its personnel roles, employing

them for both project work and staff positions of varying duration. Over the years about one-fourth of the Survey's professional posts have been filled by WAE personnel, and most of these people have held regular competitive posts with the agency at one time or another.

Contractual Arrangements to Meet Personnel Needs

There have been a variety of suggestions (and some precedents elsewhere in government) for contractual arrangements designed specifically to solve personnel problems, but most of them do not appear to be at all applicable to A.I.D.'s problem. An exception to this statement is the recently developed Overseas Educational Service (OES). This new service organization has been established in the private sector by several major national organizations—the American Council on Education, the National Academy of Sciences, and Education and World Affairs. It was designed to serve government agencies and private groups in this country and both governments and universities abroad. It will provide various services relating to the identification and recruitment of Americans, primarily from academic life and the professions, for periods of service (two years or more) in the developing countries. It will provide services at various levels, from the furnishing of actual lists of potential recruits all the way to the acceptance of contracts and grants for the handling of certain aspects of this broad set of functions.

OES will assist both U.S. and foreign employers in the recruitment of American higher educational personnel for assignments in the developing countries. In this connection it will make a particular effort to tap reservoirs of talent not yet drawn into the overseas activities, e.g., the independent liberal arts colleges. It will serve as an information center about opportunities for American college and university teachers to serve in those areas. And it will provide a mechanism through which the costs of American staff can be shared between the receiving countries and United States agencies, through the "topping up" of salaries and other devices.

In going through this chapter, some readers may have wondered whether the chief concern of this report, i.e., A.I.D.-university relations, justified quite

such a full exploration of the Agency's internal personnel policies. Obviously, we believe that it does. Not only for A.I.D. but for all of government, the increasingly popular practice of contracting out certain tasks that require specialized personnel has important implications for government personnel policy and vice versa. The two must be examined side by side.

VII. Organization

Nongovernmental Arrangements

We have listened carefully to both the enthusiasts and the skeptics on the university *consortium.* Both are convincing, and the evidence is not yet available that would prove one right and the other wrong. Clearly, the consortium can be made to work and work well. Whether it is a widely useful device remains to be seen. For the present, we would be wise not to confine ourselves to that fashionable idea but to reflect on the whole range of instrumentalities that universities have used or could use to accomplish their shared purposes—from Brookhaven to the American Council on Education. What kinds of instrumentalities are now needed to serve what kinds of multiple-university efforts overseas?

Here are some of the functions performed by instrumentalities now in existence:

1. *Combining the Strength of Several Institutions.* The most frequently cited consortium in the development field is the one composed of U.S. universities collaborating on the Kanpur project, and its obvious virtue is to bring to bear more strength and richness of resource than any one of the institutions could spare for such an effort.

2. *Performing a Function More Readily Performed by a Centralized Agency.* There is a greater variety of instrumentalities in this category than most university people imagine. The College Entrance Examination Board and the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association are such instrumentalities.

3. *Tapping Talent Outside the Leading Institutions.* If we really want to tap new resources of talent, we must find means of drawing on a far greater variety of institutions—institutions that are perfectly capable of supplying good men but lacking in the size or strength to mount a full-scale project on their own. The Overseas Educational Service would be an example of an instrumentality designed to accomplish this.

4. Lending University Sponsorship and Prestige to Semiautonomous Operations. Some of the newer multiuniversity efforts—particularly some of the scientific laboratories—involve a minimum of genuine collaborative effort. If the multiuniversity sponsorship of Brookhaven were abolished tomorrow, it is doubtful that the operation would change significantly.

We believe that these possibilities, particularly 1, 2, and 3, should be actively explored. In doing so, two cautions may be advanced. First, we should not create new instrumentalities to perform functions that could as well be performed by existing organizations. Second, we should recognize that some interuniversity ventures simply succeed in creating new entities that are completely outside the mainstream of university life, thus running counter to our principle that the overseas activities of universities should be integrally related to their home-campus activities.

A New Unit Within A.I.D.

Our study yielded conclusive evidence that A.I.D.'s present organizational arrangements for dealing with educational and human resource development are far from satisfactory, and in particular its machinery for dealing with the universities and other nongovernmental groups is inadequate. And we are convinced that present inadequacies cannot be overcome merely by strengthening the regional bureaus to deal with these problems. No one of them alone is capable of doing the job as we believe it must be done.

It seems clear to us that there must be a single, strong staff unit to carry out certain functions that we shall list below. One is tempted to describe it as a greatly strengthened Office of Technical Cooperation and Research (TCR)*, but TCR as it now exists offers only a hint of what the new unit would be like.

One of the chief concerns of the new unit would be human resource development, and since that process is not always fully understood it will be worthwhile to comment on it briefly. Human resource development

* Formerly known as the Office of Human Resources and Social Development (HRSD).

is the process of increasing the knowledge, the skills, and the capacities of people in a society. A plan for building human resources may involve assistance in development of formal education (at the primary and secondary as well as the university level), training "on the job" provided by employing institutions, programs of adult education, policies for promoting incentives to engage in productive activities, improvements in health and nutrition, and other measures for effective development of people. And a strategy of human resource development calls for an effective balance of choices between policy alternatives in accordance with carefully determined priorities. Manpower assessments and educational surveys are thus important instruments of human resource development planning.

Although impressive gains have been achieved in country planning, little attention has been given to the formulation of long-range strategies of human resource development. (We have heard denials of this, but they reflect a fairly limited notion of what educational and human resources planning should be.) And even when this element has received attention, it has rarely been integrated into broader, long-range economic development strategies. As a result, projects of technical assistance have sometimes been chosen without sufficient consideration of their strategic contribution to a country's general economic and social development.

In short, it is essential that provision be made for effectively integrating human resource development strategies with broader programs of technical assistance and general economic development. In order to do this, the new unit would have to perform the following specific functions:

1. Provide technical and professional staff assistance to the regional bureaus in formulating the educational and human resources components of country plans, recognizing that primary responsibility for such country plans lies with the bureaus.

2. Participate with other staff organizations within A.I.D. in the formulation of general policies for U.S. technical assistance and economic aid, and in particular participate with the Program Coordination Staff in the formulation of long-range development strategies for particular countries.

3. Conduct, where necessary, feasibility studies and assessments of human resource development needs and priorities in particular areas or countries.

4. Evaluate the effectiveness of all aid in the field of human resource and educational development; appraise research needs in this general area; conduct research as deemed necessary.

In any strategy of educational and human resource development, services performed by American universities and other nongovernmental groups will play a central role. Thus, the new unit must be equipped to deal with universities, foundations, research institutions and other professional organizations. In this connection it must perform the following functions:

1. Provide technical and professional staff assistance to the regional bureaus in selecting contractors for projects identified within country programs, in conducting contract negotiations, and in handling subsequent relations with the contractors.

2. Develop policies and provide policy guidance in A.I.D.'s relations with universities and other nongovernmental groups; monitor those relations and serve as a clearinghouse for criticisms from either side; engage in continuous reappraisal of the relationships and recommend reforms; keep universities continuously informed of A.I.D. objectives, policies, programs and needs; keep A.I.D. continuously informed of university requirements and problems; advise the Administrator on matters relating to university relationships.

3. Appraise institutional and trained manpower resources in the United States for overseas work in educational and human resources development; work with the universities and other nongovernmental groups to develop stronger institutional resources and a greater supply of trained manpower for such work.

4. Engage in a continual effort to improve the matching of overseas *needs* and United States resources; seek new ways to tap United States institutional and trained manpower resources, and mobilize talent from all sources; explore the potentialities of the university consortium and the university-based development institute.

5. Advise the Administrator on matters relating to research; appraise research needs, conduct research, administer a program of research grants and contracts; evaluate technical assistance projects, both contractual and direct-hire.

6. Maintain close liaison with related programs in the Department of State, Office of Education, Peace Corps, and other governmental, nongovernmental and international agencies.

The breadth of functions suggests the scope and nature of the staffing requirements. The unit would have to be staffed with individuals well acquainted with the academic and professional world outside government and capable of dealing on terms of equality with the ablest representatives of that world.

In proposing this new unit, we have confronted one of the major organizational dilemmas which A.I.D. and its predecessors, as well as other organizations operating internationally, have always had to face. On the one hand, there is a strong argument for firm control residing with regional bureau heads; and on the other, there is need to provide for professional guidance from functional staff elements such as economists or agriculturists. The type of unit recommended here protects the strength of the regional bureau, but provides technical-professional program reinforcement at a critical point. The regional bureaus would continue to be responsible for development and execution of country and regional plans and programs. However, the new unit would assist in feasibility studies, in locating contractors, and in periodic reviews of the contract program. It would do its own continuing studies of educational and human resources development throughout the world, and would be responsible for advising the Administrator on the adequacy of the Agency's activities in this field.

The new staff unit should have funds in its own budget to promote and conduct research (as TCR does now), and to assist the universities and other nonprofit groups in strengthening their work in the development field. These funds might frequently be used to supplement regional bureau funds in support of some portions of contracts.

If it is to carry out its difficult role effectively, the new unit must have a much larger staff than does the present TCR. To assign it the functions we have listed and not to assign the personnel to carry out those functions would leave us just where we are now. To some extent, the new unit should borrow and use regional bureau personnel as well as special contract personnel. It should also make use of broadly based advisory committees. But it cannot rely on temporary experts to carry the main load. It must attract and hold outstanding staff members, and with strong leadership and a broadened function, it should be able to do so. In a sense, recruiting able people and carrying out more significant functions must progress hand in hand. Each depends on the other.

Even with broader functions and strong staff, the new staff unit will need the firm support of the Administrator to command the attention and cooperation of the regional bureaus, and to carry out well its assigned tasks.

The new unit would be in close and continuous communication with the academic and professional world outside government, and would be free to create advisory panels and committees to facilitate that communication. We recommend particularly the creation of a permanent Committee on A.I.D.-University Relations to provide a forum in which mutual interests and goals can be explored, grievances aired, and reforms proposed. The committee might be jointly constituted by A.I.D., Education and World Affairs, and the American Council on Education.

It is worth emphasizing again how important it is that the new unit have adequate personnel strength (both numbers and quality), and that it enjoy the full support of the Administrator. It is possible to argue that the present TCR has been ineffective not because it lacked significant functions but because it was severely understaffed and never able to command the attention and respect of the regional bureaus. These are deficiencies that the Administrator can remedy.

VIII. A Semiautonomous Government Institute

Over and above the measures suggested so far in this report, we propose that at some time in the reasonably near future there be created a semiautonomous government institute to handle certain aspects of technical assistance, particularly those aspects dealt with by the universities.

The chief factor that leads us to propose this is the absolute *necessity* that certain technical assistance activities be relieved of the pressures for early termination that Congress and the public impose on other aspects of foreign aid. Of course those activities would be no less subject to Congressional review for being in the Institute. But we believe that if Congress and the American people were given the opportunity to see certain technical assistance activities in an organizational setting somewhat apart from the rest of the foreign aid package, they would readily grasp the essential long-term character of these activities. They would see that they are to be thought of on a par with our other long-term, international educational efforts—efforts which the nation has no intention of terminating.

The Bell Report spoke of the possibility of "a new kind of government research and development establishment which might be called a government institute." Such an institute, the report said, would reproduce within the government structure "some of the more positive attributes of a nonprofit corporation." * The goal would be to combine maximum operating flexibility with full accountability to government.

It is such an arrangement that we have in mind. It might be called the National Institute for Educational and Technical Cooperation (NIETC). It would be a separate corporate entity under its own board of trustees and would have an independent budget, but would be ultimately responsible to the A.I.D. Administrator. It would have its own career merit system and the right to establish its own levels of compensation guided by the com-

---

* Senate Document No. 94 (87th Congress, Second Session), Report to the President on Government Contracting for Research and Development (May 17, 1962), p. 24.

parability principle; and it would be so constituted that personnel of other government agencies, universities, or foundations could move in and out of it as the situation required without loss of perquisites attached to their normal employment. The board of trustees would include representatives of government departments with major international programs as well as representatives of the universities and distinguished laymen.

The working point of contact for the Institute within A.I.D. would be the new staff unit described in the preceding chapter, and some of the functions we assigned to that unit earlier would be transferred to the Institute. Here are some of the things that the Institute would do:

1. It would take over all of the basic and most of the applied research on the development process. The new staff unit within A.I.D. would retain only those research functions most directly related to operations.

2. It would use both grants and contracts to strengthen the international capabilities of the universities in the ways described in Chapter II above.

3. It would develop intimate knowledge of the institutional and trained manpower resources in the United States for overseas work in educational and human resources development. It would seek to tap new sources of talent (both individual and institutional) for such work. It would explore new means of mobilizing talent, such as the university consortium.

4. Because of the expert knowledge the Institute would develop in pursuing the above functions, it might often be turned to by the regional bureaus (and the new staff unit) to help select a contractor or do a feasibility study. In addition to such service, the Institute would have its own funds to write contracts with universities and other organizations for long-term projects in educational and human resource development. It would, of course, be in close touch with the regional bureaus and the new staff unit in A.I.D., so there would be ample opportunity to coordinate programs, but the Institute would be free to act on its own.

It should be emphasized that the creation of NIETC would not take A.I.D. out of the technical assistance business—or technical assistance out of A.I.D. It would not impair the freedom of the A.I.D. field missions or regional

bureaus to initiate whatever technical assistance activities they deem necessary. And the technical assistance activities of NIETC would be undertaken with full knowledge of and respect for the country plans developed within the regional bureaus. The chief distinction between its own program and that of the bureaus would be (a) a far heavier emphasis on research, analysis, and systematic experimentation in the development field, (b) a concern for the strengthening of U. S. universities, and (c) a consistent preoccupation with the long-term goals of technical assistance. Pursuing these emphases, the NIETC could be highly useful to the regional bureaus. Obviously, problems of coordination would arise, but they should not be formidable in two organizations reporting to the same Administrator.

The Institute could have a significant role in post-contract follow-up. Today contracts end with no provision for a continuing relationship. Yet everyone agrees that such a continuing relationship is desirable. Of course, different people mean different things when they speak of a relationship. Some see it as a relatively short-term effort by A.I.D. (or by the U. S. university or other organization) to give continuing guidance. At the other extreme, many university people see the possibility of a rooted relationship that will last for many decades. They look forward to the emergence of a world community of learning, and they like to think that the relationship they are forging under the contract will be an enduring part of that world community. Thus to them, the continuing relationship is the main point of the exercise. It will, they hope, far outlive the period in which "development" is the theme of mutual interest.

How can the continuing relationship be handled?

A.I.D. officials doubt that their agency can contribute to it, and some of them regard the whole idea of a long-term relationship as something that the government simply cannot undertake ("Domestic politics would not allow it"). But the truth is that a number of government agencies are engaged in such continuing programs both with the developing and the advanced countries—programs built not on a temporary sense of emergency but on the solid conviction that educational, cultural, and technical relations

with other nations are a vital element in the kind of world where we wish to live.

A.I.D. officials may be correct in believing that neither Congress nor the American public would approve such continuing relationships as a part of the normal A.I.D. program. But we believe that Congress might take a different view if asked to create an instrumentality apart from the regular A.I.D. program, an instrumentality designed specifically to handle long-term relationships. The National Institute of Educational and Technical Cooperation would be such an instrumentality. Conceivably Congress would take the view that it should be even farther separated from A.I.D. and that the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs would be a more appropriate home for it. But we believe that it should report to the A.I.D. Administrator. As A.I.D. terminates its programs in a country, Congress could be asked to provide for the long-term follow-up through the Institute.

As indicated earlier, however, the Institute would not be simply a repository for terminal programs. It would provide for the first time in government a vital center for thinking, planning, research, and action on the critically important long-term problems of technical assistance. It would provide a base for imaginative and pioneering approaches to the problems of educational and human resources development—problems that lie at the very heart of all economic development, all political maturing, all modernizing of social structure. With respect to this most important and difficu't of all development problems we have been inexcusably casual and aimless. We have taken innumerable, half-hearted stabs at the problem. We have treated it as something that could be solved fairly quickly. We have done everything except accord it the respect it deserves as one of the most difficult, challenging, and central problems of our time.

Eventually one might hope that the Institute would be the focal point for a wide range of international educational programs not necessarily connected with development. At the same time that the nation is engaged in technical, scientific, and educational tasks in the developing areas, it is

carrying on cultural, scientific, and educational relations with almost every country in the world. It has become increasingly clear that these are two phases of a common effort. So it would make sense to consider an eventual merging of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs into the Institute. The NIETC would then become the chief instrument for our educational and cultural relations with the rest of the world.

This would not be a giant governmental unit in terms of dollars spent or personnel employed. But more than any other agency it would embody the hopes of the American people for a better world. It could be a major factor in giving long-term meaning to the President's peace offensive.